arXiv:1610.00971v1 [math.SP] 4 Oct 2016

AMBARZUMIAN THEOREM ON GRAPHS

MÁRTON KISS

Abstract. We consider an inverse problem for Schrödinger operators on a connected equilateral graph with standard matching conditions. We prove an Ambarzumian-type result, i.e., if a specific part of the spectrum is the same as in the case of zero potential, then the potential has to be zero.

1. Introduction

Quantum graphs arise naturally as simplified models in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and engineering [3]. Ambarzumian's theorem in inverse spectral theory refers to a setting when a differential operator can be reconstructed from at most one spectrum due to the presence of a constant eigenfunction. The original theorem from 1929 states for $q \in C[0,\pi]$ that if the eigenvalues of

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} -y''+q(x)y=\lambda y \\ y'(0)=y'(1)=0 \end{array}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

are $\lambda_n = n^2\pi^2$ $(n \geq 0)$, then $q = 0$ [1]. Eigenvalues other than zero are used only through eigenvalue asymptotics to get $\int_0^1 q = 0$; hence it is enough a subsequence $\lambda_r = r^2\pi^2 + o(1)$ of them to deduce the same conclusion even if $q \in L^1(0,\pi)$. On finite intervals inverse eigenvalue problems have a vast literature. In general we mention [8] and the basic paper [2] as well as the works referenced by and referencing these. A recent stability result for Ambarzumian's theorem is found in [7]. Let us turn to the list of extensions to graphs. On a tree with edges of equal length knowing the smallest eigenvalue 0 exactly and a specific part of the spectrum approximately is enough for the recovery [4]. On a tree with different edge lengths this is still true (see Lemma 4.4 of [12]), however, the required set of eigenvalues is given by an existence proof. On the other hand, the knowledge of the whole spectrum allows

2010. Math. Subject Classification: Primary 34A55, 34B20, 34B24, 34B45; Secondary 34L40, 47A75

Key words and phrases: Ambarzumian, inverse problems, inverse eigenvalue problem, differential equations on graphs, quantum graphs, Matrix Tree Theorem.

to apply a trace formula, even if a detailed description of the spectrum is not available. The paper [6] uses heat extension in an abstract framework; this allows arbitrary graphs with arbitrary edge lengths at the expense of requiring information from the whole spectrum.

For a summary on differential operators on graphs, see [11].

In this paper we consider a connected graph $G(V, E)$ with edges of equal length. The graph can contain loops and multiple edges. We parametrize each edge by $x \in (0, 1)$. This gives an orientation on G. We consider a Schrödinger operator with potential $q_j(x) \in L^1(0, 1)$ on the edge e_j and with Neumann (or Kirchoff) boundary conditions (sometimes called standard matching conditions), i.e., solutions are required to be continuous at the vertices and the derivatives sum to zero in outward pointing local coordinate. More formally, consider the eigenvalue problem

$$-y'' + q_j(x)y = \lambda y \tag{1.2}$$

on e_j for all j with the conditions

$$y_j(\kappa_j) = y_k(\kappa_k) \tag{1.3}$$

if e_j and e_k are incident edges attached to a vertex v where $\kappa = 0$ for outgoing edges, $\kappa = 1$ for incoming edges (and can be both 0 or 1 for loops); and in every vertex v

$$\sum_{e_j \text{ starts from } v} y_j'(0) = \sum_{e_j \text{ ends at } v} y_j'(1) \tag{1.4}$$

(loops are counted on both sides).

Theorem 1.1. *Consider the eigenvalue problem (1.2)-(1.4). There are exactly $|E| - |V| + 2$ pieces of eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) such that $\lambda = (2k\pi)^2 + O(1)$ as $k \to \infty$ ($k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$). Among these eigenvalues at least one has the asymptotics $\lambda = (2k\pi)^2 + \frac{1}{|E|}\sum_j \int_0^1 q_j + o(1)$. Moreover, if G is a bipartite graph, the same is true for k instead of $2k$, i.e., there are exactly $|E| - |V| + 2$ pieces of eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) such that $\lambda = (k\pi)^2 + O(1)$ and at least one has the asymptotics $\lambda = (k\pi)^2 + \frac{1}{|E|}\sum_j \int_0^1 q_j + o(1)$.*

Remark. Although G is a directed graph, if we reverse an edge e_j and change the potential to $q_j(1 - x)$ on it, we get an eigenvalue problem with the same eigenvalues and eigenfunctions reversed on e_j.

Remark. For $q = 0$ and $\lambda = 2k^2\pi^2$ ($k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$) one eigenfunction is $\cos 2k\pi x$ and in each circle there is a Dirichlet eigenfunction $\pm \sin 2k\pi x$ on its edges (depending on the direction) and 0 everywhere else. In the bipartite case we can assume that V is a disjoint union of V_1 and V_2,

and that every edge points from V_1 to V_2. Then for k odd, we can take $\cos k\pi x$ on all edges; besides, there are Dirichlet eigenfunctions, $\pm\sin k\pi x$ alternally on the edges of a circle and 0 elsewhere. Hence in both cases there are $|E|-|V|+2$ independent eigenfunctions. It will be proved that the multiplicity is not greater.

Theorem 1.2. *Consider the eigenvalue problem (1.2)-(1.4). If $\lambda=0$ is the smallest eigenvalue and for infinitely many $k\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ there are $|E|-|V|+2$ pieces of eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) such that $\lambda=(2k\pi)^2+o(1)$, then $q=0$ a.e. on G. Moreover, if G is a bipartite graph, the same is true for k instead of $2k$, i.e., if $\lambda=0$ is the smallest eigenvalue and for infinitely many $k\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ there are $|E|-|V|+2$ pieces of eigenvalues (counting multiplicities) such that $\lambda=(k\pi)^2+o(1)$, then $q=0$ a.e. on G.*

Remark. For a tree $|E|-|V|+2=1$, and a tree is bipartite, hence Theorem 1.2 is a generalization of Theorem 1.2 in [4].
Remark. For certain graphs the multiplicities required by Theorem 1.2 can be weakened to $|E|-|V|+1$, see the remark at the end.

2. The proof

Denote by $c_j(x,\lambda)$ the solution of (1.2) which satisfies the conditions $c_j(0,\lambda)-1=c_j'(0,\lambda)=0$ and by $s_j(x,\lambda)$ the solution of (1.2) which satisfies the conditions $s_j(0,\lambda)=s_j'(0,\lambda)-1=0$. Each $y_j(x,\lambda)$ may be written as a linear combination

$$y_j(x,\lambda)=A_j(\lambda)c_j(x,\lambda)+\tilde{B}_j(\lambda)s_j(x,\lambda). \tag{2.1}$$

Then $y_j(0,\lambda)=A_j(\lambda)$ is the same on each outgoing edge; hence we choose to index the functions $A(\lambda)$ by vertices, and then

$$y_j(x,\lambda)=A_v(\lambda)c_j(x,\lambda)+\tilde{B}_j(\lambda)s_j(x,\lambda), \tag{2.2}$$

if e_j starts from v. If the eigefunctions are normed, i.e., $\sum_j\|y_j(x,\lambda)\|_2^2=1$, then $A_v(\lambda)=O(1)$, $\tilde{B}_j(\lambda)=O(\sqrt{\lambda})$ ([4]). For later calculations it is more convenient to work with the $O(1)$-variables $A_v(\lambda)$ and $B_j(\lambda)=\frac{\tilde{B}_j(\lambda)}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$.

The coefficients A_v and B_j form a $(|V|+|E|)$-vector, which satisfies $|V|$ pieces of Kirchoff conditions at the vertices and $|E|$ pieces of continuity conditions at the incoming ends of edges, namely, for all $v\in V(G)$,

$$\sum_{e_j:\ldots\to v}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}A_{v_j}(\lambda)c_j'(1,\lambda)+B_j(\lambda)s_j'(1,\lambda)-\sum_{e_j:v\to\ldots}B_j(\lambda)=0, \tag{2.3}$$

where in the first sum v_j denotes the starting point of e_j; and for all $e_j \in E(G)$,

$$A_u(\lambda)c_j(1,\lambda) + \sqrt{\lambda}B_j(\lambda)s_j(1,\lambda) - A_v(\lambda) = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

if e_j points from u to v.

The matrix of this homogeneous linear system of equations has the form $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$, where

- A is like an adjacency matrix; $a_{uv} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \sum c'_j(1,\lambda)$, the sum is taken on edges pointing from u to v;
- B and C are like incidence matrices;

$$b_{vj} = \begin{cases} s'_j(1,\lambda) & \text{if } e_j \text{ ends in } v \\ -1 & \text{if } e_j \text{ starts from } v \\ s'_j(1,\lambda) - 1 & \text{if } e_j \text{ is a loop in } v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$c_{jv} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } e_j \text{ ends in } v \\ c_j(1,\lambda) & \text{if } e_j \text{ starts from } v \\ -1 + c_j(1,\lambda) & \text{if } e_j \text{ is a loop in } v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- D is a diagonal matrix, $d_{jj} = \sqrt{\lambda}s_j(1,\lambda)$.

The elements of M have the following asymptotics for $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + d + o(1)$ (see [4] eq. (2.3) or [12] Lemma 3.1):

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}c'_j(1,\lambda) = (-1)^k \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(\int_0^1 q_j - d\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right), \tag{2.5}$$

$$s'_j(1,\lambda) = (-1)^k + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right), \tag{2.6}$$

$$c_j(1,\lambda) = (-1)^k + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right), \tag{2.7}$$

$$\sqrt{\lambda}s_j(1,\lambda) = (-1)^k \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(d - \int_0^1 q_j\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right). \tag{2.8}$$

Lemma 2.1. *If $\lambda = (2k)^2\pi^2 + O(1)$, or $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ and G is bipartite, then every $|V| \times |V|$ submatrix of C (and of B) has determinant at most $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$.*

Proof. Leaving out the $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$-terms from the submatrix we make only $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$ error in its determinant. What we get is an incidence matrix of a graph with $|V|$ peaks and $|V|$ edges. This must contain a circle, hence the corresponding rows are dependent. The proof for B is similar. □

Lemma 2.2. *The determinant of M is $O(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(|E|-|V|+2)})$.*

Proof. Look at the terms in the Laplace expansion. Taking $(|V|-1)$ factors from B (and consequently from C) we have to take $(|E|-|V|+2)$ factors of magnitude $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$ from A and D; otherwise, we get smaller terms, using the previous lemma. □

The next statement is a version of the Matrix Tree Theorem ([10, 13]).

Theorem 2.3. *If $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ and k is even or G is bipartite, then*

(2.9)

$$\det M = (-1)^{k|V|} \sum_{\tau} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \sum_{e_j \in G} c_j'(1,\lambda) \right) \prod_{e_j \notin \tau} \sqrt{\lambda} s_j(1,\lambda) + o(\lambda^{-\frac{|E|-|V|+2}{2}}).$$

where the sum is taken for all spanning tree τ of G.

Proof. The main terms in the Laplace expansion are those which contain exactly $(|E|-|V|+1)$ elements from D. The product of a fixed set of $(|E|-|V|+1)$ elements in D is weighted by the determinant of the respective minor, with all other elements of D substituted by zero. The remaining rows in C and columns in B look like an ordered (or unordered) incedence matrix of the graph τ spanned by the remaining $(|V|-1)$ edges for k even (or odd, respectively). If τ contains a circle, then the determinant of the minor is $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$. Otherwise τ is a spanning tree of G; then the determinant is the sum of the elements in A (plus $o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}})$), as it follows from the next two lemmas. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let τ be a spanning tree of G, and R is the ordered vertex-edge incidence matrix for τ. Consider the matrix $M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} X & R \\ -R^T & Y \end{bmatrix}$, where Y is an $(|V|-1)\times(|V|-1)$ zero matrix and X has only one nonzero element s. Then the determinant of M_1 is s, independently of the position of the nonzero element in X.*

Proof. In the Laplace expansion every nonzero term (in fact, there is only one) contains an element from X, hence it is enough to prove for $s = 1$. Let the indices of the nonzero element in X be uv. First we prove that the determinant of M_1 is independent of v. Indeed, two arbitrary vertices corresponding to v_1 and v_2 are linked through the tree, hence we can add to (or subtract out of) the u-th row the rows corresponding to that path. Similarly, the determinant does not depend on u. Reversing an edge in G does not change the determinant; by this and by adding rows (and corresponding columns) we can assume that τ is a path. Then taking $u = |V|$, $v = 1$ and expanding the determinant from left to the right we get $((-1)^{|V|})^{|V|-1} = 1$. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be a bipartite graph, τ be a spanning tree of G, and R is the unordered incidence matrix for τ. Consider the matrix $M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} X & -R \\ -R^T & Y \end{bmatrix}$, where Y is an $(|V|-1)\times(|V|-1)$ zero matrix and X has only one nonzero element, $x_{uv} = s$, such that $(uv) \in E(G)$. Then the determinant of M_1 is $(-1)^{|V|}s$, independently of u and v.*

Proof. There is only one nonzero term in the Laplace-expansion of the determinant, which contains only ± 1's besides s, hence $\det M_1 = \pm s$. If V is a disjoint union of V_1 and V_2 such that all edges connenct V_1 to V_2, then let us multiply by (-1) the rows in R corresponding to V_1 and the columns in R^T corresponding to V_2, respectively. This multiplies the determinant by $(-1)^{|V|}$ while leaves the nonzero element of X unchanged for $(uv) \in E(G)$. Hence the statement follows from the previous lemma. □

Substituting the asymptotics (2.5)-(2.8) we get

Corollary 2.6. *If $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + d + o(1)$ and k is even or G is bipartite, then*

$$\det M = (-1)^{k|E|}\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\right)^{|E|-|V|+2} p(d) + o(\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}(|E|-|V|+2)}), \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$p(d) = \sum_{\tau}\left(\sum_{e_j\in G}\int_0^1 q_j - |E|d\right)\prod_{e_j\notin\tau}(d - \int_0^1 q_j), \tag{2.11}$$

the outer sum is taken for all spanning tree τ of G.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

λ is an eigenvalue of the eigenvalue problem (1.2)-(1.4) if and only if $\det M(\lambda) = 0$. Let the distinct roots of $p(d)$ be $d_1, \dots, d_l$. By the previous corollary for $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ the distinct roots of $\det M(\lambda)$ are exactly of the form $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + d_j + o(1)$ $(1 \le j \le l)$. As it is seen from (2.11), one of them is $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + \frac{1}{|E|}\sum_{e_j\in G}\int_0^1 q_j + o(1)$.

It remained to prove that the total multiplicities of the eigenvalues $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ are exactly $|E| - |V| + 2$. A direct calculation shows that this is true for $q = 0$. Indeed, if $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ is an eigenvalue for $q = 0$, then by (2.11) $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + o(1)$. If $\lambda \neq k^2\pi^2$ then D is invertible and $\det M = \det(D)\det(A - BD^{-1}C)$ where the second factor is a diagonally dominant matrix. Otherwise A and D are zero matrices, thus the rank of M is $2(|V|-1)$, and its nullspace is exactly $(|E| - |V| + 2)$-dimensional. Then consider the eigenvalue problem

$-y'' + tq_j(x)y = \lambda y$ with the boundary conditions (1.3)-(1.4) for $t \in [0,1]$. The corresponding operator $T(t)$ forms a selfadjoint holomorphic family and its eigenvalues $\lambda_n(t)$ and normed eigenfunctions $g_n(t)$ can be represented by holomorphic functions of t (see Example VII-3.5 and Theorem VII-3.9 in [9]).

$$\lambda_n'(t) = \langle g_n(t), T'(t)g_n(t)\rangle = \int_G g_n^2(t)q \tag{2.12}$$

is bounded by $\|g_n\|_\infty^2\|q\|_1 = O(\|q\|_1)$ (see (2.2) and the paragraph below it). Hence $|\lambda_n(1) - \lambda_n(0)| = O(1)$ and the total multiplicity of eigenvalues $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + O(1)$ is the same for all $q \in L^1$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

According to Theorem 1.1,

$$\int_G q = \sum_{e_j \in G} \int_0^1 q_j = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

Let us denote the operator of the eigenvalue problem (1.2)-(1.4) by L. $\langle \varphi, L\varphi\rangle \geq \lambda_0 = 0$ and equality holds if and only if φ is an eigenfunction of L. It follows that the constant 1 must be an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue 0. Substituting this to (1.2) gives $q(x) = 0$. □

Remark. The statement of Theorem 1.2 can be strenghtened if the number of spanning trees not containing a fixed edge is the same nonzero integer for every non-loop edge. Namely, it is enough that the total multiplicity of $\lambda = k^2\pi^2 + o(1)$ be $|E| - |V| + 1$. Indeed, suppose that $\sum_{e_j \in G} \int_0^1 q_j \neq 0$. Then by (2.11)

$$\prod_{e_j \text{is a loop}} (d - \int_0^1 q_j) \sum_\tau \prod_{\substack{e_j \text{is not a loop} \\ e_j \notin \tau}} (d - \int_0^1 q_j) = d^{|E|-|V|+1}, \tag{2.14}$$

as loops are not contained in spanning trees. Hence if e_j is a loop then $\int_0^1 q_j = 0$, and the sum of the roots of the second factor must also be zero. Thus $\sum_{e_j \in G} \int_0^1 q_j = 0$ and we can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Interesting examples are the complete graph or a graph with one point and a loop, which corresponds to the case of periodic boundary conditions treated in [5].

References

1. V. Ambarzumian, *Über eine Frage der Eigenwerttheorie*, Zeitschrift für Physik **53** (1929), 690–695.
2. G. Borg, *Uniqueness theorems in the spectral theory of* $y^{"} + (\lambda - q(x))y = 0$, Proc. 11th Scandinavian Congress of Mathematicians (Oslo), Johan Grundt Tanums Forlag, 1952, pp. 276–287.
3. G. Berkolaiko and P. Kuchment, *Introduction to quantum graphs* AMS, 2013, ISBN 978-0-8218-9211-4.
4. R. Carlson and V. Pivovarchik, *Ambarzumians theorem for trees*, Electronic J. Diff. Eqns., **142** (2007), 1–9.
5. Y. H. Cheng, T. E. Wang and C. J. Wu, *A note on eigenvalue asymptotics for Hills equation*, Appl. Math. Lett. 23 (9) (2010) 10131015.
6. E. B. Davies, *An inverse spectral theorem*, Journal of Operator Theory, **69**, (2013), no. 1, 195–208.
7. M. Horváth, *On the stability in Ambarzumian theorems*, Inverse Problems, **31**, (2015), no. 2, article id. 025008.
8. ———, *Inverse spectral problems and closed exponential systems*, Ann. of Math. **162** (2005), no. 2, 885–918.
9. T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1980.
10. G. Kirchhoff, *Über die Auflösung der Gleichungen, auf welche man bei der Untersuchung der linearen Verteilung galvanischer Ströme geführt wird*, Ann. Phys. Chem. **72** (1847), 497–508. (English transl. IRE Trans. Circuit Theory **CT-5** (1958), 4–7.)
11. P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs: an introduction and a brief survey*, in: Analysis on Graphs and its Applications, Proc. Symp. Pure. Math., AMS, 2008, 291–314.
12. C. K. Law, E. Yanagida, *A solution to an Ambarzumyan problem on trees*, Kodai Math. J. **35**, (2012), no. 2, 358–373.
13. W. T. Tutte, *Graph theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2001, Cambridge New York, ISBN 9780521794893

Department of Differential Equations
Institute of Mathematics
Budapest University of Technology and Economics
H 1111 Budapest, Műegyetem rkp. 3-9.
E-mail address: mkiss@math.bme.hu